

RESPONSE TO CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 7, 18 and 22 stand objected to because of informalities. Specifically, various claims are alleged to depend from themselves or from a system claim when the claim is a method claim. Each of claims 7, 18 and 22 have been amended to correct this informality. Accordingly, Applicant believes that this objection has been overcome as well.

RESPONSE TO REJECTION OF CLAIMS BASED UPON ASSERTED PRIOR ART

Each of claims 1-34 stands rejected under either 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,260,064 to Kurzrok and/or Kurzrok in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,084 to Philips. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the amendments made to the claims. Specifically, each of the two independent claims (claims 1 and 15) have been amended to clarify distinctions between the present invention and the Kurzrok and Philips references. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the author interface module is “operably connected to the Internet, for receiving a portion of a work from an author to be reviewed via the Internet.” While the Office Action cites Kurzrok as allegedly providing an author interface module, the element cited in Kurzrok (element 20) is not operably connected to the Internet to the system where the work is uploaded. Accordingly, this distinction alone differentiates claim 1 from Kurzrok.

In addition, however, an additional element has been added to claim 1 which recites “security means for implementing at least one security mechanism to limit the ability of users to plagiarize the work.” The patent specification provides numerous examples of ways in which plagiarism can be limited, including providing only a portion of the work to the reader, providing time stamps, limiting the number of readers who have access to a work, as examples. *See* pages 16 and 17 of the specification. Neither Kurzrok nor Philips disclose or suggest a system in which an author publishes a work to a system over the Internet and wherein security mechanisms are implemented to limit the access of users to plagiarize the work. In fact, Kurzrok teaches away from such a feature because it clearly discloses and suggests the benefits of posting works using hypertext markup language (html). As is well known in the art, html when presented in a web browser is readily accessible to users to copy and paste at the users will. Accordingly, text

can be easily plagiarized and copied without any limitation whatsoever. Accordingly, Kurzrok's explicit teaching to use html explicitly teaches away from any limit placed on plagiarism.

Similarly, the method claim (claim 15) has been amended to recite that the portion of a work from an author is received "via an Internet communication from a remote computer system," and that the work is stored "at a host computer system." Again, Kurzrok and Philips fail to disclose collectively this feature. Additionally, method claim 15 recites the step of "implementing at least one security mechanism to limit the ability of users to plagiarize the work." As discussed above, Kurzrok explicitly teaches away from this element.

New dependent claims 34 and 35 have also been added to specifically recite that the at least one security mechanism "comprises providing only a portion of the work to limit access of the reader to the entirety of the work." This feature is also specifically not disclosed or suggested by Kurzrok or Philips and provides an additional element that should be allowable over the art of record.

Accordingly, Applicant's amendments to clarify distinctions between the claims and the art of record traverse those rejections based on Kurzrok and Philips.

CONCLUSION


Applicant asserts that all pending claims are allowable over the art of record and therefore this application is in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner allow these claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are any other fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.11 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

If the Examiner has any remaining informalities to be addressed, prosecution can be expedited if the Examiner contacts the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such informalities.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Brian M. Buroker
Registration No. 39,125

HUNTON & WILLIAMS
1900 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 955-1935

Dated: April 19, 2004